REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and discussion presented herein.

1. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-12, 14-36, and 39-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-36, and 39-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez-Diaz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,858) and Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,008).

(a) Claim 1. Claim 1 is an independent claim within this group of claims, and is drawn to a system for providing area surveillance.

The rejection asserts that "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose means for dynamically allocating bandwidth over said AC power-line for said video imaging devices*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of MPEG providing dynamic bandwidth allocation.

After carefully reviewing the grounds for rejection the Applicant responds as follows.

The Ramirez-Diaz reference illustrates a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, wherein at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line (e.g., block 406 of Fig. 8B). Yet, this reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 1. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach "*means for dynamically allocating bandwidth over said AC power-line for said video imaging devices*".

Regarding the combination put forth with Smith to support the rejection, it should be recognized that Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. Thus, there is no need for allocating bandwidth between different video imaging devices. The abstract further bears this out regarding video display: "*Under control of an operator, full-field images are selectively recalled from the digital memory and converted to a lower resolution for display on a monitor. The operator selects a region-of interest from the full-field display through the use of a*

computer pointing device, such as a mouse. The selected area is then displayed on the monitor in its full acquired resolution, thereby allowing the operator to view high resolution images of a large area under surveillance."

Furthermore, the Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and in fact never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

However, Applicant agrees that Smith recites the use of MPEG video formatting, within which different bandwidth requirements can be supported. Applicant's specification even discusses utilizing MPEG (e.g., paragraph [0052]) for encoding the output from the video imaging devices. Toward clarifying the distinctions of Claim 1, Applicant has amended the claim to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 1 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*at least one bandwidth configuration setting within said at least one video imaging device; said bandwidth configuration setting can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings which alter the bandwidth necessary for transmitting said video data stream over said AC power-line.*" It should be recognized that Claim 1 describes precisely how the video imaging device is controlled toward supporting bandwidth allocation. The last element of the claim additional recites the relationship to the means for "*dynamically allocating bandwidth*", as in response to "*remotely adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings within said at least one video imaging device.*"

Consequently, it is seen in these recitations that the dynamic allocation means is configured to interact with multiple imaging devices for establishing bandwidth configuration settings within the imaging devices to alter the bandwidth generated by each device. This language makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art immediately clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentably

distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(b) Claim 12. Independent Claim 12 is rejected in a similar manner as Claim 1 discussed above.

The rejection asserts that "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose wherein said computer server is configured to dynamically allocate bandwidth for video imaging devices in response to predetermined or event-driven settings*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

As already discussed, the Ramirez-Diaz reference illustrates a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, wherein at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line (e.g., block 406 of Fig. 8B). Yet, this reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 12. Applicant concurs that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach dynamic allocation of bandwidth.

However, regarding supporting the rejection in response to a combination with Smith, it should be recognized that Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. Thus, there is no need for allocating bandwidth between different video imaging devices. As previously discussed, the abstract further bears this out regarding video display. The Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

Toward clarifying the distinctions of the claim, Applicant has amended Claim 12 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 12 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*at least one bandwidth configuration setting within said at least one video imaging device; said bandwidth configuration setting can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings which alter the bandwidth necessary for transmitting said video data stream over said AC power-line*". Claim 12 describes how the video imaging device is controlled by a server toward allocating the bandwidth that will be pushed through the AC power-line. It will be noted that there is no such control put forth any of the cited references. The last element of the claim additional recites the relationship to the computer server for "*dynamically allocating bandwidth*", as in response to "*remotely adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings within said at least one video imaging device based on predetermined or event-driven settings.*"

Consequently, the interaction between the computer server and the imaging device(s) provide for establishing bandwidth configuration settings to alter the bandwidth generated by each device - such liimitations are not asserted and nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The language of the claim makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art immediately clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 12. Thus, Claim 12 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 12.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(c) Claim 25. Independent Claim 25 is rejected in a similar manner as Claims 1 and 12 discussed above.

The rejection asserts that the reference "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically*

disclose the dynamic bandwidth allocations are received from said server, and video signals from said image sensor subject to said dynamic bandwidth allocation is transmitted to said server". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

This aspect has already been generally discussed in relation to Claims 1 and 12, as the Ramirez-Diaz reference illustrates a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, wherein at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line. Applicant concurs that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach dynamic allocation of bandwidth, and furthermore that the Smith reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 25. .

It should be recognized that Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. Thus, there is no need for allocating bandwidth between different video imaging devices. As previously discussed, the abstract further bears this out regarding video display. The Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and in fact never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

In clarifying the distinctions of the claim Applicant has amended Claim 25 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 25 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*at least one image sensor configured for transmitting a video data stream as a signal over an AC power-line; at least one bandwidth configuration setting associated with said at least one video imaging device; said bandwidth configuration setting can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings which dynamically alter the bandwidth of said video data stream transmitted over said AC power-line*." Claim 25 describes how the video imaging device is controlled by a server toward allocating the bandwidth that will be pushed through the AC power-line. It will be noted that there is no such control put forth any of the cited references. The last element of the claim additional recites the

relationship to the computer server for "*wherein video signals from said image sensor are subject to said dynamic bandwidth allocation in response to adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings based on commands received from the server prior to transmission of said video data stream through said AC power-line ~~are transmitted~~ to said server*."

Consequently, the interaction between the computer server and the imaging device(s) provide for establishing bandwidth configuration settings to alter the bandwidth generated by each device - such is nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The amended claim language makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art immediately clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 25. Thus, Claim 25 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 25.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 25, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(d) Claim 34. Independent Claim 34 is rejected in a similar manner as Claims 1, 12 and 25 discussed above.

The rejection asserts that the reference "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose the dynamic bandwidth allocations are received from said server, and video signals from said image sensor subject to said dynamic bandwidth allocation is transmitted to said server*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

This aspect has already been generally discussed in relation to Claims 1, 12, and 25, as the Ramirez-Diaz reference illustrates a security system with multiple video feeds

to a security system, wherein at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line. Applicant agrees that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach dynamic allocation of bandwidth, while Applicant further asserts that the Smith reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 34.

It should be recognized that Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. There is no need for allocating bandwidth between different video imaging devices - as borne out in the abstract of the reference. The Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and in fact never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

Clarifying the distinctions of the claim, Applicant has amended Claim 34 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 34 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*a power-line interface configured for communicating over an AC power-line with multiple remote video imaging devices which are configured for transmitting a video data stream as a signal over an AC power-line; wherein at least one bandwidth configuration setting associated with each of the remote video imaging devices; wherein said bandwidth configuration setting can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings which dynamically alter the bandwidth of said video data stream transmitted over said AC power-line*". Claim 34 describes how the video imaging device is controlled by a computer server toward allocating the bandwidth that will be transmitted through the AC power-line. It will be noted that there is no such control put forth any of the cited references. The last element of the claim additional recites the relationship to the computer server for "*said bandwidth allocation in response to adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings based on commands received by each remote video imaging device from the computer server prior to transmission of said video data stream from each remote video imaging device*".

As a result, the interaction between the computer server and the imaging

device(s) provide for establishing bandwidth configuration settings to alter the bandwidth generated by each device - such is nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The amended claim language makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art immediately clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 34. Thus, Claim 34 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 34.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 34, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(e) Claim 39. Independent Claim 39 is rejected in a similar manner as Claims 1, 12, 25, and 34 discussed above.

The rejection asserts that the reference "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose controlling the bandwidth of said video data streams generated by said video imaging devices when multiple video imaging devices are active; and wherein bandwidth is dynamically allocated between all said video streams generated by said video imaging devices*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

The dynamic bandwidth allocation aspect has already been generally discussed in relation to Claims 1, 12, 25, and 34. Ramirez-Diaz illustrates a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, in which at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line. Applicant agrees that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach controlling bandwidth from multiple imaging devices, or dynamic allocation of bandwidth, while Applicant further asserts that the Smith reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 39.

It should be recognized that Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. There is no need for allocating bandwidth between different video imaging devices - as there is but one video device in Smith, as borne out in the abstract of the reference. There is no need or configuration in Smith for controlling bandwidth allocation between these multiple video imaging devices, while further the Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and as mentioned above never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

Clarifying the distinctions of the claim, Applicant has amended Claim 39 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 39 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*a power-line interface configured for receiving video data streams from multiple video imaging devices ~~connected to said power-line interface~~ which are configured for transmitting a video data stream as a signal over an AC power-line; wherein at least one bandwidth configuration setting associated with each of the remote video imaging devices; wherein said bandwidth configuration setting can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings which dynamically alter the bandwidth of said video data stream transmitted over said AC power-line*". Claim 39 describes how the video imaging device is controlled by a computer configured for communicating the video streams and for "*controlling the bandwidth of said video data streams generated by said video imaging devices when multiple video imaging devices are active*". It will be noted that there is no such form of bandwidth control put forth in any of the cited references. The last element of the claim additionally recites the relationship to the computer server for "*wherein said dynamic allocation is performed in response to adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings based on commands received by each of the multiple video imaging devices prior to transmission of said video data stream*".

These recitations indicate that the interaction between the computer and the multiple imaging devices provide for establishing bandwidth configuration settings to

alter the bandwidth generated by each device, and is nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The amended claim language makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art immediately clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 39. Thus, Claim 39 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 39.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 39, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(f) Claim 43. Independent Claim 43 is rejected in a similar manner as Claims 1, 12, 25, 34, and 39 as discussed above.

The rejection asserts that the reference "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose controlling the bandwidth of said video data streams generated by said video imaging devices*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

Dynamic bandwidth allocation has already been generally discussed in relation to Claims 1, 12, 25, 34, and 39. Ramirez-Diaz teaches a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, in which at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line. Applicant agrees that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach dynamic bandwidth allocation, while Applicant further asserts that the Smith reference does not disclose a number of aspects recited in Claim 43.

As discussed previously, Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. There is no need for allocating bandwidth between video imaging devices - as there is but one video device in Smith, as borne out

in the abstract of the reference. There is no need or configuration in Smith for controlling bandwidth allocation between video imaging devices, while further the Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and as mentioned above never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

Clarifying the distinctions of the claim, Applicant has amended Claim 43 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 43 recites aspects of the video imaging device as having: "*wherein at least one bandwidth configuration setting for each of the video imaging devices can be remotely adjusted to any of multiple settings for dynamically altering the bandwidth of the video data stream transmitted over the power-line communications network*". Claim 43 describes how the video imaging device receives configuration settings for altering the bandwidth of the video data stream. It will be noted that there is no such form of bandwidth control put forth in any of the cited references. The last element of the claim additionally recites the relationship to the computer server for "*wherein bandwidth is dynamically allocated within the ~~between all said~~ video imaging devices in response to adjusting said bandwidth configuration settings based on commands received by the video imaging devices prior to transmission of said video data stream*".

These recitations indicate that the interaction with the imaging devices provide the bandwidth configuration settings to alter the bandwidth generated by each device. These elements are nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The language of the amended claim makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 43. Thus, Claim 43 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their

combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 43.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 43, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(g) Claim 44. Independent Claim 44 is rejected in a similar manner as Claims 1, 12, 25, 34, 39, and 43 as discussed above.

The rejection asserts that the reference "*Ramirez-Diaz does not specifically disclose dynamic bandwidth allocation*". The rejection then proposes the combination with the Smith reference on the basis of the use of dynamic bandwidth allocation within the MPEG data.

Dynamic bandwidth allocation has already been generally discussed in relation to Claims 1, 12, 25, 34, 39, and 43. Ramirez-Diaz teaches a security system with multiple video feeds to a security system, in which at least a portion of the video feeds are capable of communication over a power-line. Applicant agrees that the Ramirez-Diaz reference does not teach dynamic bandwidth allocation.

As discussed previously, Smith utilizes a single "*linescan camera*" (abstract) which collects high-resolution images. There is no need for allocating bandwidth between video imaging devices - as there is but one video device in Smith, as borne out in the abstract of the reference. There is no need or configuration in Smith for controlling bandwidth allocation between video imaging devices, while further the Smith reference does not describe dynamic bandwidth allocation and as mentioned above never uses the term "*allocation*", while only using terms for "*bandwidth*" twice in relation to a different context.

Clarifying the distinctions of the claim, Applicant has amended Claim 44 to recite the aspects of dynamically allocating bandwidth with greater particularity.

Amended Claim 44 recites aspects of generating the video signals "*within at least one video imaging device*." In addition the generation of signals is recited as "*controlling at least one bandwidth configuration setting which determines the bandwidth necessary*

for transmitting said video signals". It will be seen from this that the video imaging device receives configuration settings for altering the bandwidth of the video data stream. It will be noted that there is no such form of bandwidth control put forth in any of the cited references. The relationship between the settings the allocation are recited as "*subject to a dynamic bandwidth allocation in response to said bandwidth configuration settings*". Another added element recites "*communicating said bandwidth configuration settings from said computer server to said at least one video imaging device*", in which is seen the relationship to the computer server in controlling video bandwidth allocation.

These recitations indicate that the interaction with the imaging devices provide the bandwidth configuration settings to dynamically allocate bandwidth as it controls the bandwidth generated by each device transmitting on the AC power line. These elements are nowhere found in the cited references, either separately, or in combination with one another and what is known in the art.

The language of the amended claim makes the difference between the present invention and the prior art clear. Using MPEG protocols which can be set to different bandwidth needs does not comport to specific control of bandwidth configuration settings within the image device itself, as recited in Claim 44. Thus, Claim 44 is patentably distinct because the teachings of Ramirez-Diaz, or Smith, and/or their combination with what is known in the art does not provide teaching, suggestion or motivation for the inventive aspects recited in Claim 44.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 44, and the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

(h) Claims 3-5, 7-11, 14-24, 26-33, 35-36, and 40-42.

Each of the dependent claims within the above group of claims should be considered *a fortiori* allowable in view of the demonstrated patentability of its parent claims.

However, a number of these claims recite aspects which provide additional

support for patentability, the following are a few of these provided by way of example.

Claim 3. This dependent claim describes: "*dynamically allocated bandwidth is responsive to the bandwidth needs of additional video imaging devices*"; wherein nothing is put forth in the rejection showing how the bandwidth is allocated between these "*additional video imaging devices*". Ramirez-Diaz admittedly lacks dynamic allocation, Smith lacks multiple video imagers, and neither provides any teachings of controlling the bandwidth allocations of across multiple imaging devices, in particular in response to controlling the settings of the imaging devices.

Claim 4. This dependent claim describes: "wherein said dynamic allocation of bandwidth is performed in response to predetermined and event-driven settings". The only thing put forth toward allocation of bandwidth in Smith is in regard to the use of the MPEG standard. It is well understood that MPEG is a data compression mechanism in which the level of compression can be selected. However, as discussed in the independent claims, this cannot be equated to controlling a set of imaging devices to alter configuration settings so that bandwidth allocation is changed. Thus, nothing in either reference, or with their combination with what is known in the art, provides the necessary support for the obviousness rejection.

Claim 5. This dependent claim describes: "*wherein said dynamic allocation of bandwidth modulates the amount of bandwidth allocated to said video imaging device in response to a detected motion event*". Here the recited art has the same shortcomings as in Claim 4, but with the added problem that neither the Ramirez-Diaz or Smith reference provides any teaching of changing the configuration of the imagers (bandwidth allocation) in response to detected motion events. These shortcomings of the rejection also exist for Claims 14 and 27 which contain similar matter as Claim 5.

Similar shortcomings of the rejection exist for a number of the other dependent claims.

2. Rejection of Claims 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ramirez-Diaz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,858) and Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,008), in view of Datari (U.S. Pat. No. 6,418,169).

Claims 37-38. Dependent Claims 37-38 should be considered *a fortiori* allowable in view of the demonstrated patentability of parent Independent Claim 34.

3. Amendment to Claims 1, 6-7, 12, 25, 34, 39, 43, and 44.

Claims 1, 12, 25, 34, 39, 43, and 44. These independent Claims of the instant application have been amended to recite additional aspects regarding the bandwidth allocations; so that these are not confused with the use of the MPEG compression mechanism within which the compression and rate of a transmission can be selected.

The relationship of bandwidth configuration settings is now recited in these independent claims. Support for which is found in original Claim 6 (now canceled) and throughout the specification, including paragraph [0012].

The step references (a)-(d) were also removed from Claim 44 according to present office practices.

Claim 6. Canceled.

Claim 7. The preamble of dependent Claim 7 was amended to correct the reference to the parent claim number.

4. Amendments Made Without Prejudice or Estoppel.

These amendments have been made without any prejudice, waiver, or estoppel, and without forfeiture or dedication to the public, with respect to the original subject matter of the claims as originally filed or in their form immediately preceding these amendments. Applicant does not acquiesce in the original ground for rejection with respect to the original form of these claims, and reserves the right to pursue the original scope of these claims in the future, such as through continuation practice, for example.

5. Conclusion.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the various grounds for rejection in the Office Action be reconsidered and withdrawn with respect to the presently amended form of the claims, and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for the

present application to pass to issuance.

In the event any further matters remain at issue with respect to the present application, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner please contact the undersigned below at the telephone number indicated in order to discuss such matter prior to the next action on the merits of this application.

Date: April 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

John P. O'Banion, Reg. No. 33,201
M. Robyn Carrillo, Reg. No. 47,474
Rodger H. Rast, Reg. No. 45,853
O'BANION & RITCHEY LLP
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1550
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 498-1010